



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

confession, true or false—a theory which could scarcely merit serious consideration. The decision of the majority of the court, in so far as it is based upon this portion of the evidence, would seem therefore to stand on a somewhat infirm foundation.

DEEDS—SEPARATE WRITINGS CONSTRUED TOGETHER.—Plaintiff sued for the recovery of land and offered in evidence a deed as part of his claim of title. In connection with this deed, and as part of it, plaintiff offered also a separate piece of paper, containing matter of description, continuous with and supplemental to the description of property embodied in the deed proper, and which though not signed, nor referred to in the deed proper, was delivered to the grantee along with the deed and as part of it. *Held*, it was properly received in evidence as part of the deed. *Kyle v. Jordan* (Ala. 1914), 65 So. 522.

In view of the law in regard to evidence aliunde the instrument, either will or deed, this decision seems to take a dangerous trend. It is well settled that extrinsic documents *referred to* in deeds may be resorted to for identification of the property or estate intended to be conveyed. *Heffelman v. Otsego Water-Power Co.*, 78 Mich. 121, 44 N. W. 1151; *Allen v. De Groodt*, 105 Mo. 442, 16 S. W. 494, 1049; *Hoffman v. City of Port Huron*, 102 Mich. 417, 60 N. W. 831; *Ford v. Belmont*, 30 N. Y. Super. Ct. (7 Rob.) 97; *Watson v. Boylston*, 5 Mass. 411. In these cases the emphasis is placed on the reference in one instrument to the other. The court itself makes mention of the analogy in the law of wills that an extrinsic document cannot be treated as a part of a will unless it is distinctly referred to, accurately described, and in actual existence. *Bryan's Appeal*, 77 Conn. 240, 58 Atl. 748, 68 L. R. A. 353, and note, 107 Am. St. Rep. 34, 1 Ann. Cas. 393; *Bryan v. Bigelow*, 77 Conn. 604, 60 Atl. 266, 107 Am. St. Rep. 64, and note; *Estate of Young*, 123 Cal. 337, 342, 55 Pac. 1011; *Fickle v. Sneh*, 97 Ind. 289, 49 Am. Rep. 449; *Tonnele v. Hall*, 4 N. Y. 140; *Baker's Appeal*, 107 Pa. St. 381, 52 Am. Rep. 478. These analogies are refuted by the court, however, and the evidence admitted on the ground that it was continuous, coherent, and consistent with that part of the deed which it purports to supplement. It would seem that to allow the introduction of such evidence without any reference to it in the body of the deed, is to destroy the safeguards of the parole evidence rule.

DIVORCE—WIFE'S REFUSAL TO FOLLOW HUSBAND NOT DESERTION.—Plaintiff and defendant, husband and wife, occupied one-half of a double house owned by the wife's mother who lived in the other half. Difficulties soon arose between defendant and his mother-in-law, and when the situation became unbearable, he moved away to another part of the city. The plaintiff refused to follow him. There was evidence to show that the wife was in poor health, and that her mother aided her in her household duties, and that she had a more comfortable home where she was, than her husband could provide. *Held*, that the wife's refusal to follow her husband did not constitute desertion. *Copping v. Termini*, (La. 1914) 65 So. 132.